

Appl. No. 10/552,979
Atty. Docket No. Z-7882Q
Amdt. Dated January 10, 2011
Reply to Office Action of September 9, 2010
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-13, and 15-23, are pending. Any additional claims fee can be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-2480.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 12, 17, and 23, have been amended. With regard to the amendment of claims 1, 17, and 23, support for the amendments can be found in the specification, for example, at page 6, lines 8-20. With regard to the amendments of claims 4, 6, and 12, support for the amendments can be found in the claims as filed.

It is believed these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Office has objected to claims 4, 6, and 12, for reasons provided in the Office Action. Applicants have amended claims 4, 6, and 12, and respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to these claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Liebig.

The Office has rejected claims 1-3, 7, 9, 13, 15, 17, 18, and 23, as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 801,026, issued to Liebig, hereafter, “Liebig”. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 1 and 17 recite the following, in part, “a first broad longitudinal side of the ram disposed between ends of face sides of the ram and a second broad longitudinal side of the ram opposite the first broad longitudinal side, wherein the second longitudinal broad longitudinal side is shorter than the first broad longitudinal side”. In contrast, the plunger 17 of Liebig has first broad longitudinal side 5 and second longitudinal side 6, as defined by the Office, which are the same length. Accordingly, Applicants assert that Liebig does not teach or suggest all of the claim elements of claims 1 or 17. Additionally, because claims 2-3, 7, 9, 13, and 15, depend from claim 1 and claim 18 depends from claim 17, Applicants assert that Liebig similarly fails to teach or suggest

Appl. No. 10/552,979
Atty. Docket No. Z-7882Q
Amdt. Dated January 10, 2011
Reply to Office Action of September 9, 2010
Customer No. 27752

their claim elements. Therefore, Applicants assert that Liebig does not anticipate claims 1-3, 7, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18.

Claim 23 recites, in part, “a first broad longitudinal side of the ram disposed along a first line extending between ends of face sides of the ram and a second broad longitudinal side of the ram extending outward relative to a second line such that the central region includes an enlarged projecting area disposed on only one of the broad longitudinal sides of the ram”. The enlarged projecting area is not addressed by the Office; however, in reviewing the figure provided by the Office, Liebig does not teach or suggest all of the claim elements of claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants assert that Liebig does not anticipate claim 23.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Liebig.

Claims 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Liebig. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 4 and 6 depend from claim 1. As stated previously, Liebig fails to teach or suggest all of the claim elements of claim 1. As such, Liebig fails to teach or suggest all of the claim elements of claims 4 and 6. Accordingly, Applicants assert that claims 4 and 6 are nonobvious over Liebig.

Claims 12, 16, 20, and 21, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Liebig. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 12 and 16 depend from claim 1 and claim 20 and 21 depend from claim 17. As stated previously, Liebig fails to teach or suggest all of the claim elements of claims 1 and 17. As such Liebig fails to teach or suggest all of the claim elements of claims 12, 16, 20, and 21. Accordingly, Applicants assert that claims 12, 16, 20, and 21 are nonobvious over Liebig.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Liebig in view of Jobst.

Appl. No. 10/552,979
Atty. Docket No. Z-7882Q
Amdt. Dated January 10, 2011
Reply to Office Action of September 9, 2010
Customer No. 27752

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liebig in view of U.S. 2,084,345, issued to Jobst, hereafter, "Jobst". Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1. As discussed previously, Liebig fails to teach or suggest all of the claim elements of claim 1. Moreover, there is no assertion by the Office that Jobst teaches the elements of claim 1 lacking from Liebig. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established against claims 10 and 11. As such, Applicants assert that claims 10 and 11 are nonobvious over the suggested combination of Liebig and Jobst.

Conclusion

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the entry of the amendments herein, withdrawal of the rejections under § 102(b) and § 103(a), and reconsideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By: /George H. Leal/ _____
Signature

George H. Leal _____
Typed or Printed Name
Registration No. 56,813
(513) 983-0841

Date: January 10, 2011
Customer No. 27752